

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended no claim. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 19, 21-23 and 25-28 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Response in paragraph 10. In paragraph 10, page 6 of the Detailed action, the Examiner indicated that, in the Choe reference, the procedure of a subscriber to set personalized preferences of multimedia information to be provided to a caller was the same as the Applicant's "demand" for presenting multimedia information that is present in the subscriber data. In the Response, the Examiner indicated that if the Applicant felt that this is a novel feature, different from the cited art, the Applicant is encouraged to amend the claims. The Applicant respectfully contends that the "demand" feature is novel and is already present in the claims; there is no need to amend the claims. The explanation by the Examiner in the Response does not show that Choe or Heinonen disclose that "...a subscriber's data comprises a demand for presenting the multimedia information;..." as disclosed in the independent claims of the present invention.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choe, et al. (US 2004/0114732 A1, hereinafter "Choe") in view of Heinonen, et al. (US 6,671,370).

The Applicant traverses the rejection of these claims and respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to claim 19.

19. (Previously Presented) A method, in a telecommunications network, of providing multimedia information associated with called party terminal to a calling party terminal, the method, performed by a core network node, comprising the steps of:

retrieving subscriber data of the called party, wherein the subscriber data comprises a demand for presenting the multimedia information;

receiving in the core network node a call set up message comprising an identification of the called party,

recognizing, according to the subscriber data and the received identification of the called party, the demand for providing the multimedia information, and

sending a network address or Universal Resource Locator (URL) to the calling party terminal for retrieving the multimedia information.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above-emphasized limitations of claim 19 are not taught or suggested in the Choe reference, the Heinonen reference or a combination of the Choe and Heinonen references.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the emphasized portions of claim 19, at least "a demand" being present in subscriber data, are not addressed or refuted by the Examiner. In the Applicant's invention, the "demand" is added to subscriber data so as to cause the network node, when accessing the subscriber data, to send the multimedia information. (In the Response to Arguments above, the Examiner touched on the issue). The Applicant respectfully contends that a "demand for providing multimedia information" is not disclosed by either the Choe or the Heinonen references.

In re Lowry states that, "All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability." *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994) The Applicant respectfully submits that all the limitations of the Applicant's claimed invention are not considered. In comparing the Choe reference and the Heinonen references to the claimed invention to determine obviousness, limitations of the presently claimed invention may not be ignored. The present invention claims a demand being present in a subscription and sending information to a calling party and such features are not taught or suggested by Choe and Heinonen. Therefore, the Applicant contends that claim 19 is not obvious in view of Choe and Heinonen.

This being the case, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither Choe nor Heinonen, whether considered individually or in combination, disclose the above discussed limitations. The Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of independent claim 19 and analogous independent claims 23, 27 and 28.

Claims 21 and 25 depend from claims 19, and 23 respectively and include further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 19 and 23. Therefore, the allowance of claims 21 and 25 is also respectfully requested.

Claims 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choe and Heinonen in view of Nguyen et al (US 2004/0120477 A1). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Nguyen reference is cited as teaching multimedia information is provided using a packet switched connection. The cited portion of Nguyen discloses routing "... communication requests between the various elements...". The Applicant respectfully submits routing messages through a signal transfer point is not the same as sending multimedia information using a packet switched connection. The Applicant respectfully submits that Nguyen fails to provide the elements lacking in the combination of the Choe and Heinonen references. Claims 22 and 26 depend from independent claims 19 and 23 respectively and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 19 and 23. Therefore, the allowance of claims 22 and 26 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sidney L. Weatherford/

By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: December 15, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com
(972) 583-8658